

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
_____ Field Office

_____, CO 8 _____

DOCUMENTATION OF LAND USE PLAN CONFORMANCE AND NEPA ADEQUACY

NUMBER: CO-____-2004-00__ DNA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER (optional):

PROJECT NAME:

PLANNING UNIT:

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

APPLICANT:

ISSUES AND CONCERNS (optional):

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION:

LAND USE PLAN (LUP) CONFORMANCE REVIEW: The proposed action is subject to the following plan:

Name of Plan: _____ Resource Management Plan

Date Approved:

_____ The Proposed Action is in conformance with the LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decision(s):

Decision Language:

_____ The Proposed Action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decisions (objectives, terms, and conditions):

REVIEW OF EXISTING NEPA DOCUMENTS:

List by name and date all existing NEPA documents that cover the Proposed Action.

Name of Document:

Date Approved:

List by name and date any other documentation relevant to the Proposed Action (e.g., biological assessment, biological opinion, watershed assessment, allotment evaluation, and monitoring report).

Name of Document:

Date Approved:

NEPA ADEQUACY CRITERIA:

1. Is the Proposed Action substantially the same action and at the site specifically analyzed in an existing document?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

2. Was a reasonable range of alternatives to the Proposed Action analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s), and does that range and analysis appropriately consider current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

3. Does the information or circumstances upon which the existing NEPA document(s) are based remain valid and germane to the Proposed Action? Is the analysis still valid in light of new studies or resource assessment information?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

4. Does the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA document(s) continue to be appropriate for the Proposed Action?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

5. Are the direct and indirect impacts of the Proposed Action unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA document?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

6. Are the cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the Proposed Action unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

7. Is the public involvement and interagency review associated with the existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the Proposed Action?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

INTERDISCIPLINARY REVIEW: Identify those team members conducting or participating in the NEPA analysis and preparation of this work sheet (by name and title).

Name

Title

Review Completed

REMARKS:

Cultural Resources:

Native American Religious Concerns:

Threatened and Endangered Species:

MITIGATION:

COMPLIANCE PLAN (optional):

NAME OF PREPARER:

NAME OF ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATOR:

DATE:

CONCLUSION

CO-____-2004-00__ DNA

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the land use plan and that the NEPA documentation previously prepared fully covers the Proposed Action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that either the proposal does not conform with the land use plan, or that additional NEPA analysis is needed.

SIGNATURE OF RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL: _____
_____, Field Manager

DATE SIGNED:

Note: The signed Conclusion on this worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal decision process and does not constitute an appealable decision.